DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 081 CS 010 852

AUTHOR Farrell-Moskwa, Claire
TITLE The Relationship between Learning Style and Academic Achievement.
PUB DATE May 92
NOTE 37p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Cognitive Style; Correlation; Educational Research; Grade 5; Intermediate Grades; Middle Schools
IDENTIFIERS California Achievement Tests; Middle School Students

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the correlation between students' learning styles and their academic achievement on report cards and standardized tests. Subjects were 58 fifth-grade students in a suburban middle school. The "Learning Style Inventory" by Brown and Cooper was administered to this population, and students' academic averages and California Achievement Test scores were obtained from their cumulative folders. Results indicated that, overall, there was a negligible relationship between learning style and academic achievement; but that there did seem to be a relationship between certain learning styles and academic performances when they were examined on an individual basis. (Four tables of data are included; 26 references, an appendix of data, and the Learning Style Inventory are attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343081

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING STYLE AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

by

Claire Farrell-Moskwa

Accepted
3/26/92

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Masters of Arts Degree

Kean College of New Jersey

May, 1992

CS010652

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Farrell - Moskwa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the correlation between students' learning styles and their academic achievement on report cards and standardized tests. The subjects for the study consisted of a sample of fifty - eight fifth graders in a suburban middle school.

The Learning Style Inventory by Brown and Cooper was administered to the sample population. Students' academic averages and California Achievement Test scores were obtained from their cumulative folders.

The findings of this study were twofold. The overall data indicates that there is a negligible relationship between learning style and academic achievement. In contrast to the overall finding is that there seems to be a relationship between certain learning styles and academic performances when they are examined on an individual basis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to all the members of my family for their unending support and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		page
I.	Abstract	i
II.	Acknowledgement	ii
III.	List of Tables	iv
IV.	Correlation Between Learning Styles and Academic Achievement	
	Introduction	1
	Hypothesis	2
	Procedures	4
	Results	4
	Conclusion and Implications	7
V.	Related Research	10
VI.	References	22
VII.	Appendices	25

LIST OF TABLES

Table		page
I.	Correlation of Grade Equivalent on CAT and Learning Style entire sample	5
II.	Correlation of Report Card Averages and Learning Styles	5
III.	Mean Grade Equivalent and Individual Learning Styles	6
IV.	Mean Report Card Average and Individual Learning Styles	7

If one were to look up the word "individual" in a dictionary, it would be defined as: a person distinguished by specific attributes or identifying traits. Children are individuals. Therefore, it would be safe to conclude that children have specific attributes or identifying traits. As educators we need to focus on the distinctive and specific attributes that have an impact on learning. It is in fact, these distinctive or marked peculiarities that we refer to as Learning Style.

While many people would agree that children have their own learning style, they do not necessarily define learning style in the same way. Gregorc explains, "Learning style consists of distinctive behaviors which serve as indicators of how a person learns from and adapts to his environment. It also gives clues as to how a person's mind operates." (Gregorc, 1979). Dunn, Dunn, and Price believe that learners are affected by their environment, emotional, sociological and physical preferences. They have distinguished eighteen elements of learning style. David Hunt feels that learning style describes students in terms of those educational conditions under which they are most likely to learn. One last researcher, David Kolb (1985), asserts that learning style is a result of hereditary equipment, past experience, and the demands of the present environment combining to produce individual orientations to four learning modes. (Dunn,1981).

The definitions may differ, but the importance and implications of learning style are universal. Today's classroom holds a varying population of students. These children come from all different backgrounds and they come to us with different abilities. Most importantly, they come to us with their own unique, individual learning style.

Ramirez and Castaneda believe that because learning style is not permanently fixed, it is possible to intervene and affect it. Therefore, if one learning style promotes higher academic achievement than other learning styles, it would appear possible to use it for children who show a nonpreference in learning styles.

If a significant and a moderate to a high relationship can be found between learning style and academic achievement, as measured by report card grades or standardized tests, a teacher can use alternate teaching strategies for students who have differing learning styles. It is important to recognize the need for different teaching techniques to meet the needs of the variety of students in our heterogenously grouped classrooms. "If we teach to a student's learning preference, he or she will learn more efficiently. Achievement goes up and frustration comes down." (Brown and Cooper, 1983).

HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant relationship between learning styles and academic performance as measured by either grades on report cards or standardized tests.

DEFINITIONS

Learning Style Theory - a topic in education that recognizes the need for alternative instructional methods and techniques to meet the needs of the variety of students in heterogenously grouped classrooms.

Learning Style Inventory (L.S.I.) - an evaluative instrument designed specifically to determine the learning style preferences of students.

Auditory Language - The way a student hears words; processing spoken words.

Visual Language - The way a student sees words; processing written language.

Auditory Numerical - The way a student hears numbers; processing spoken numerical values.

Visual Numerical - The way a student sees numbers; processing written numerical values.

Tactile/Concrete - The way a student learns by doing or involvement; emphasizing the experiencing or manipulative learning styles.

Group Learner - A student who likes to work with at least one other person when there is important work to be done.

Individual Learner - A student who works best alone; usually a self-starter, and frequently finds working with other students distracting.

Oral Expressive - A student who prefers to say what he knows; answers or explanations usually given orally.

Written Expressive - A student who prefers to write down answers or explanations.

Visual Linguistic/Numerical - The way a student sees words and numbers; processing written language and processing written numerical values.

Auditory Linguistic/Numerical - The way a student hears words and numbers; processing spoken words and processing spoken numerical values.

PROCEDURES

Subjects for this study consisted of fifth grade students in regular classrooms. . These students were from a suburban school district. The sample population consisted of fifty - eight students.

Each student was administered Brown and Cooper's (1983) Learning Style Inventory. The students' answers were then fed into a computer that analyzed their responses. The computer program made a determination, based on the students' answers, as to their individual learning style.

Report card grades on each student were obtained from cumulative folders. Each student's fourth grade final Reading average and Total Reading score from the California Achievement Test was also recorded.

A comparison and correlational analysis of the reading test scores and the individual learning styles was used to determine if a significant relationship existed between learning style and academic achievement as measured by report card grades and standardized tests.

RESULTS

There was no correlation between the students' learning style and grade equivalent on the California Achievement Test

as can be seen in table I.

Table I

Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation of the Sample's Grade Equivalent on the California Achievement Test and Learning Style

	M	S.D.	r
Grade Equivalent	6.22	2.74	-.06
Learning Style	3.93	2.59	

There was, however, a slight correlation between the students' learning style and their academic achievement as measured by report card grades. This is illustrated in table II.

Table II

Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation of the Sample's Report Card Averages and Learning Styles.

	M	S.D.	r
Report Card Averages	85.10	5.92	.19
Learning Styles	3.93	2.59	

A reorganization of the data makes it easier to see the strengths and weaknesses among the individual learning styles. Table III illustrates the mean grade equivalent for each learning style.

Table III

Mean and Standard Deviations of the Sample's Grade Equivalent and individual Learning Styles.

Learning Style	N	M	S.D.
Visual Language	7	8.23	3.21
Visual Numeric	20	5.60	2.52
Auditory Language	4	5.65	1.03
Auditory Numeric	8	7.19	1.86
Tactile Concrete	3	3.63	.67
Social Individual	5	5.22	2.41
Social Group	1	7.80	0.00
Oral Expressive	5	7.66	3.20
Written Expressive	5	7.04	3.51

While there was a negligible correlation between grade equivalent and learning style, table III does show that students who are Visual Language learners have the highest mean grade equivalent (8.23) on the California Achievement Test. It also illustrates that Tactile Concrete learners have the lowest mean grade equivalent (3.63) on the California Achievement Test.

Table IV illustrates the sample population's report card averages in relationship to their individual learning styles. In this table we see that students who learn best in Social Groups have the highest Report Card Grades (92). Table IV also

Table IV

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Sample's Report Card Grades and individual Learning Style.

Learning Style	M	S.D.
Visual Language	88.57	5.22
Visual Numeric	81.55	5.01
Auditory Language	85.75	3.30
Auditory Numeric	88.25	5.28
Tactile Concrete	79.33	3.51
Social Individual	82.00	4.64
Social Group	92.00	0.00
Oral Expressive	90.00	4.64
Written Expressive	87.20	5.85

shows that students who are Tactile Concrete learners have the lowest Report Card Grades (79.33).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study are twofold. The overall data indicates that there is a negligible relationship between learning styles and academic achievement. In contrast to this overall finding is that there seems to be a relationship between certain learning styles and academic performance when they are analyzed on an individual basis.

The results found are supportive of the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between learning styles and academic performance as measured by either grades on report cards or standardized tests. Therefore the hypothesis of this study is accepted.

However, students with certain types of learning styles seem to demonstrate either higher or lower academic achievement in both their report card grades and on their standardized tests. Students who are identified as Visual Language learners boast an 8.23 mean grade equivalent and an 88.57 mean report card average. Students who learn best in Social Groups or are Oral Expressive tend to have higher academic achievement as well. While there were three learning styles which leaned toward higher academic performance, there was only one that had obvious lower academic success: Tactile Concrete.

It has often been said that gifted children will learn in spite of their teachers. The same cannot be said for students who struggle. The finding that children who learn best by using tactile and concrete approaches also have the lowest academic achievement should be a clear indicator that as educators we need to differentiate our techniques to meet the needs of our students. Students who cannot grasp abstract concepts need to be given an alternate approach using more "hands-on" activities. As students reach intermediate and high school their classroom instruction becomes more lecture oriented. It is important to realize that students' learning styles do not necessarily change

as they grow older. As educators we need to teach to our students' learning preferences so that they will learn more efficiently and attain higher academic success.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING STYLES AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT : RELATED RESEARCH

"Every human being has a unique way of perceiving, evaluating, and communicating. These differences are matters of personal style. Our classrooms are as diverse in types of style as our 'melting pot' nation is diverse in types of people." (Hilgersom-Volk, 1987). It is the responsibility of the classroom teacher to identify a student's learning style and to use it to best benefit that child.

While many people would agree that children have their own learning style, they do not necessarily define learning style in the same way. Keefe defined learning style as, "Characteristic, cognitive, affective, and physiological behaviors that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment." (NASSP<1979). Dunn (1989) defines five strands of work associated with learning styles. These five areas include environment, emotional, sociological, physical elements and psychological strands. Gregorc explains, "Learning styles consist of distinctive behaviors which serve as indicators of how a person learns from and adapts to his environment. It also gives clues as to how a person's mind operates." (Gregorc, 1979). Hunt (1970) believes that learning style describes students in terms of those educational conditions under which they are most likely to learn. David Kolb (1985) asserts that learning style is a result of hereditary equipment, past experience, and the demands of the present environment combining to produce individual orientations to four learning modes.

McCarthy represents the opposite view in that learners should be taught how to adapt to a variety of learning styles. She believes, "The real meaning of learning style theory lies in the process required to move all learners through a cycle of learning that encompasses all four styles while still honoring and developing the uniqueness of each style as we go." (McCarthy, 1980).

The definitions may differ, but the importance and implications of learning styles are universal. Today's classroom holds a varying population of students. These children come to us with different abilities. Most importantly, they come to us with their own unique, individual learning style.

Researchers Brown and Cooper (1983) acknowledge that there is much evidence that people do not learn in the same way. Barbe (1981) stated that teachers teach the way they learn best, rather than by how they were taught. Brown and Cooper also believe that many teachers use a teaching strategy that has proven most successful in their own learning and use it for whole group instruction. They state, "If we require students to receive information in a way which does not correspond with their personal dominant learning modes, to perform under conditions which interfere with their learning, or to demonstrate their learning in a manner which does not allow them to use their strengths, we create artificial stress, reduce motivation, and depress performance results." It is because of this that they developed their own learning style inventory.

Brown and Cooper assess three categories of learning styles and subdivide them into nine areas. Cognitive style refers to the preferred mode of taking in information and is divided into five areas: auditory language, visual language, auditory numerical, visual numerical, and tactile/concrete. Social style refers to the learner preference for working in a group or alone. Expressive style refers to the preferred methods of giving out information and is divided into oral expressive and written expressive.

"The challenge to educational programs is to create a variety of alternatives to meet the different styles." (Sarocho, 1980). It is worthy of a teacher to try new approaches if they are truly beneficial to their students. The research available would lead one to believe that learning styles deserve some very serious thought.

Smith and Holliday (1986) investigated differences in learning styles of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students achieving at high, low and average levels. The 207 students who participated in this study were from a midwestern, suburban, rural community. The researchers administered a learning styles inventory to each student. They grouped students into ability levels based on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Smith and Holliday then analyzed the relationship between the ability levels and the results from the learning styles inventory.

The study showed that high and low ability students perceive themselves as more responsible and less responsible respectively. Low achievers felt they needed more structure, are more adult

oriented, preferred learning through several approaches and desiring more visual material during instruction. High achievers preferred a more independent, less adult oriented approach to learning. Average achievers did not display any significant preference for a particular style. These findings can be used for teachers to develop strategies to potentially enhance learning of the different achievement groups.

Ristow, Edeburn and Ristow (1986) made a comparison of gifted and above-average middle grades students in small schools. The population for this study involved a group of thirty gifted and thirty above-average children from grades six, seven and eight. The students were given the Renzulli-Smith Learning Style Inventory.

The results of the study showed that gifted students prefer Independent Study as a means to learning. Gifted students also preferred Programmed Instrution which might be indicative of the self-initiating, internally motivated nature of these children. The above-average students preferred Discussion, possibly because they may need the feedback of others to "turn-on" to education. Interestingly, the study supported the theory that gifted children have their own learning style and that each child's preference needs to be explored before making any rash judgments.

Cage (1982) was also interested in the relationship between learning styles, self-report, self-concept, academic achievement and academic aptitude among academically gifted students. His sample population also included fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students. All of these students were enrolled in an enrichment

program for students with an IQ >120. Part of his research included the administration of the Dunns' Learning Style Inventory and the Piers-Harris Self-concept Scale. Data from both the California Achievement Test and the California Short Form of Academic Aptitude Test was retrieved. Cage then analyzed the results from all of these tests.

He summarized, "Certain learning style variables, taken in combination, are significantly related to higher achievement among academically gifted student. This finding further supports the position that teachers of academically gifted students should use learning style preferences in their teaching strategies." Many people would feel comfortable in saying that this principle would be safe to apply to other student populations besides the academically gifted.

Dunn, Giannitti, Murrray, Rossi, Geisert and Quinn (1990) examined the effects of matching and mismatching students with a preference for learning alone or learning with peers with selected instructional treatments in order to determine the impact upon their attitudes and achievements in social studies. The sample population included 104 students in grades six, seven and eight. Each student was given Dunn and Dunn's Learning Style Inventory and the Semantic Differential Attitude Questionnaire. Students were classified into one of two groups: those with strong preference or no preference for learning alone or with peers. Each group participated in social studies lessons that studied the learning-alone condition and the small group condition.

The study reported significant findings indicating that students permitted to learn through their preference achieved statistically higher achievement and attitude scores. It also demonstrated that no-preference adolescents learned better than they did with their peers.

Pfeifer and Dudley (1984) were interested in studying the relationship between learning styles and sex, race, and socio-economic status. The sample population included over one thousand eighth grade students. Like many other researchers, Pfeifer and Dudley administered Dunn and Dunn's Learning Style Inventory at the start of their research investigation. They used the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills to measure reading and language arts competency. Data related to sex and race was taken from the students' records. A students' socioeconomic status was determined by the school's lunch program, whether they qualified for free or reduced lunch. The data was then analyzed.

The research indicated that there were very significant differences in learning styles between boys and girls. Girls were more motivated, persistent, responsible and peer oriented than boys. Boys were more tactile than girls. There were also differences among the races. Caucasian and Black students were more persistent than Hispanic students, Blacks were more visual and Caucasians wanted less structure. All three socioeconomic groups were significantly different from each other in need for noise, for design, and tactile experiences. Repeated instances in the literature describe significant increases in student performance when learning activities allow for variation

of learning styles.

It is easy to be critical of some of the research available. Davis (1988) researched teachers' learning styles and students' learning styles. She wanted to find out if students scores would be higher if they shared the same learning style as their teacher. The participants in the study were from a four year liberal arts college and were all entering freshman. The study included administration of a learning style inventory to both the entering students and their english professors. At the end of the first semester the students grades were collected. Davis then made a comparison of Kolb's four types of learners. Kolb (1985) asserts that learners can be divided into four types of learners. The first group is "divergers" who learn from concrete experience. Secondly, there are "assimilators" who grasp experience through abstract conceptualization. The third group is "convergers" who learn through active experimentation. The final group is "accomodators" who rely on reflective observation.

The study, however, did not produce the results that the researcher expected. Davis anticipated the scores to be significantly higher for those students whose style matched that of their teacher, they were not. Davis attributed this to the population studied and maintained that there should have been significantly higher gains.

There is a great deal of research available that is in support of matching student learning styles with that of their teacher. Greene (1972) has been able to show that individuals with similar cognitive styles describe each other in a highly

positive way, while individuals with different cognitive styles have a tendency to describe each other in negative terms. Packer and Baine (1978) assert that teachers are most effective with students who match their learning style. According to Hunt (1970), "It is important to find the optimum match between characteristics of children and the educational setting, including the personal characteristics of teachers."

Sarocho and Dayton (1980) conducted a study to determine the relationship between the cognitive style of teachers and academic achievement gains of their students. The study used three instruments: The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills to measure basic skills, the adult's and children's forms of the Embedded Figures Test to measure cognitive style, and teacher's questionnaires to collect demographic information form teachers. The sample population included children and teachers in both second and fifth grade.

Sarocho and Dayton categorize teachers as either field-dependent or field-independent. Witkin, Moore, Goodenaugh and Cox (1977) define field-dependent students as better at learning material with social context and field-dependent teachers using an inter personal style. They assert that field-independent students learn from experiences and depend on general principles and field-independent teachers lecturing.

The results indicated a significant effect for teacher's cognitive style. Students of field-independent teachers achieved higher scores. The results also indicate that the achievement scores are not affected by the match of teachers and children but

that cognitive style of the teachers may have an impact on children's gains. The study found that field-dependent teachers underestimated field-independent students. This finding is of great importance in that teacher expectations have the potential to generate self-fulfilling prophecies. In sum, it is in the best interest of the children for teachers to be aware of their own learning style and to allow for diversity in their students.

Dunn and Griggs (1989) visited several high schools to observe learning style programs. Each high school addressed the need of their population differently. Corsicanna High School taught its students to create their own hands-on resources and to teach themselves when their teacher's styles did not match their own. Midwest High School had different classrooms to best suit its students' different learning style; some were traditional and some were style responsive. Sacred Heart Academy bases its success on flexible scheduling and rotating classes by cycle so all courses would be taught at some time during students' peak energy levels. The teachers at Cedar Crest High School had to go before the Board of Education for permission to have radios in school. While the method of implementation of a learning styles program differed, the basic theory remained constant: teach to a child's individual strengths.

The largest problem facing learning style programs is the hesitance of the teachers to implement them. Elementary teachers feel overwhelmed by the individualization of the program. Many administrators are also not willing to provide the support for developing a new program. There are, however, districts that try

using a learning styles approach and then get hooked on it.

The success in using a student's learning style can best be seen at Roosevelt Elementary School in Hutchinson, Kansas. The principal, Patricia Lemmon, attended a conference given by Rita and Kenneth Dunn and became excited about using learning styles in her school. She spent the entire next year working with the staff to develop their ability to recognize learning style traits and how to best accomodate them. The following year she requested the teachers to administer the Dunns' learning style inventory to all the children in the school in order to diagnose their learning style. Once a child's learning style was diagnosed, the teachers were expected to provide suitable accomodation for that style.

There were many ways that the teachers individualized instruction. Children who were found to be partial to light or heat were given special seating near the source of light or heat, as were children not partial to them. Children who worked better alone were allowed to sit away from the group. Children were encouraged to dress to suit their own temperature needs. Students were permitted to do their work where they felt most comfortable: be it at their desk or on the floor with a pillow or quilt. Children were even allowed to munch on fruits or vegetables if it helped them to work better. Most importantly, teachers addressed and taught to a child's perceptual strengths; visual, auditory, kinesthetic or tactile.

The results of all the individualized teaching were astounding. "The teachers reported improved attitudes, better

work habits, and higher test scores," said Lemmon. (1985) She also used time of day preferences for scheduling classes and taking standardized tests. The school's fifth grade, which had four years of test results to use for comparison, median class score rose by 1.6 years. In addition to the scores going up, the parents became more enthusiastic and involved in their children's education.

Sykes, Jones and Phillips (1990) also boast about their school's success. Blake Middle School in Minnesota has adopted a "style" all their own. The students have all taken the Dunns' learning style inventory and are aware of their own learning style. The students are encouraged to work with their teachers to create a curriculum that will most benefit them. The teachers are also encouraged to teach in a way that they are most comfortable. The parents are also excited about the program and how they find the information in their child's profile useful in helping them understand why their child approaches learning as he or she does.

David Cavanaugh (1981) not only boasts of the success students at Worthington High School, in Ohio, are achieving, but gives specific examples of what the teachers do. The teachers design Contract Activity Packages so that students can complete their objectives in ways that complement their learning styles. They have also developed a Methods Factor Coordination Sheet which matches learning styles to suggested prescriptions. The district has also prepared a seven-step outline that gives an overview of the entire management system.

There is a wealth of research that supports the importance of learning style based education. Teachers should be aware that children learn best when they are taught through their preferred learning style. As reading specialists we need to go beyond the visual, auditory, kinesthetic and tactile approaches with which we are familiar. In addition to these psychological input processes, students have very distinct preferences as to their environmental, emotional, sociological and physical surroundings.

Teachers who are in touch with their own learning style preferences are at an advantage to help their students. Heath (1979) stated, "Teachers who are aware of their strengths and weaknesses are able to analyze objectively, understand accurately, care for their students and respect their diversity." While the match/mismatch theory does not show conclusive evidence to the advantages and/or disadvantages of the practice, a teacher's awareness of the difference or sameness between their students and themselves should prove beneficial to all.

Finally, there are many schools for whom learning style based education has made a difference for their students. It seems in these particular schools the parents, teachers, students, and standardized tests are in agreement that the knowledge and instruction of individual learning styles does promote higher academic achievement. "Diversity is a unique positive component in American Education; students should not feel negative results as its by-product." (Pfeiefer and Dudley, 1984) Individualized instruction based upon a child's unique learning style assures them that they don't.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Barbe, W.B., and Milone, M. N. "What We Know about Modality Strengths. " Educational Leadership. Vol. 38, no. 5, 1981: 378 - 380.

Brown, Jerry, F., and Cooper, Richard, M. "Learning Styles Inventory." Freeport, NY: Educational Activities, Inc., 1983.

Cage, Bob N. "Teaching by Learning Style: a Viable Alternative for Academically Gifted Students." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the SouthWest Educational Research Association. Austin, TX, Feb. 1982.

Cavanaugh, David, P., "Student Learning Style: a Diagnostic/ Prescriptive Approach to Instruction." Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 63, no. 3, Nov. 1981: 202 - 203.

Davis, Jane Furr, "On Matching Teaching Approach with Sudent Learning Style: Are We Asking the Right Question?" Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting in the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Louisville, KY. Nov 8 - 11, 1988.

Dunn, Rita, "Rita Dunn Answers Questions on Learning Styles." Educational Leadership, Vol. 48, no. 2, Oct. 1990: 15 - 19.

Dunn, Rita, and Griggs, Shirley, "Learning Styles: Key to Improving Schools and Student Achievement." Curriculum Report, Vol. 18, no. 3, Jan. 1989.

Dunn, Rita, and others, "Grouping Students for Instruction: Effects of Learning Styles on Achievement and Attitude." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 130, no. 4, Aug. 1990: 485 - 494.

Greene, M. A., "Client Perception of the Relationship as a Function of Worker - Client Cognitive Styles." Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.

Gregorc, Anthony, F., "Editorial: Learning/Teaching Styles: Potent Forces Behind Them." Educational Leadership, Jan. 1979: 234 - 236.

Heath, D., "Toward Teaching as a Self-Renewing Calling." Paper Presented at the Conference on Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research. Sponsored by the Research Development Center at the University of Texas, Austin, Jan. 10 - 12, 1979.

Hilgersom-Volk, Karin, "Celebrating Students' Diversity Through Learning Styles." OSSC Bulletin, Vol. 30, no. 9, May, 1987.

Hunt, D. E., "A Conceptual Level Matching Model for Coordinating Learner Characteristics with Educational Approaches." Interchange, Vol. 1, no. 3, 1970: 68 - 82.

Keefe, James, W., "Student Learning Styles and Brain Behavior." Selected Papers from the National Conference Sponsored by the Learning Styles Network. Reston, VA, NASSP, 1982.

Kolb, David, The Learning Style Inventory. (2nd Edition), Boston, Mass., McBer and Company, 1985.

Lemmon, Patricia, "A School Where Learning Styles Make a Difference." Principal, Vol. 64, no. 4, March, 1985: 26 - 28.

McCarthy, Bernice, The 4MAT System: Teaching to Learning Styles with Right/Left Mode Techniques. Barrington, IL, Excel, Inc., 1980.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. "Students Learning Styles: Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs. Reston, VA, NASSP, 1979.

Packer, J., and Bain, J.D., "Cognitive Style and Teacher - Student Compatibility." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 70, 1978: 864 - 871.

Pfeifer, Jeri, and Dudley, Pat, "The Effects of Learning Styles on Reading and Language Arts and Differences in Learning Styles among Groups of Eigth Grade Students." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English, Dallas, TX, Feb. 2 - 4, 1984.

Ristow, Robert, Edeburn, Carl, and Ristow, Gwen, "Learning Preferences: A Comparison of Gifted and Above-Average Middle Grade Students in Small Schools." Roeper Review, Vol. 8, no. 2, Nov. 1985: 119 - 124.

Sarocho, Olivia. "The Relationship Between the Teacher's Cognitive Style and their Perceptions of their Students' Academic Achievement." Educational Research Quarterly, Vol. 5, no. 3, Fall, 1980: 40 - 49.

Sarocho, Olivia, and Dayton, C. Mitchell, "Relationship of Teacher's Cognitive Styles to Pupil Academic Achievement Gains." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 72, no. 4, Aug. 1980: 544 - 549.

Smith Douglas, and Holliday, Peter, "Learning Style and Academic Achievement in Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Grade Students." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 16 - 20, 1986.

Sykes, Susan, Jones, Bruce, and Phillips, Jane, "Partners in Learning Styles at a Private School." Educational Leadership, Vol. 48, no. 2, Oct. 1990: 24 - 26.

Witkin, H.A., Moore, C.A., Goodenough, D.R., and Cox, P.W., "Field-Dependent and Field-Independent Cognitive Styles and their Educational Implications." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 47, no. 1, 1977: 1 - 64.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Student Number	CAT Score	Academc Average	Learning Style
1.	3.2	83	Tactile Concrete
2.	2.7	79	Visual Numeric
3.	7.8	92	Social Group
4.	7.1	79	Visual Numeric
5.	7.0	88	Auditory Language
6.	5.1	81	Visual Numeric
7.	4.7	84	Auditory Numeric
8.	5.5	79	Social Individual
9.	5.1	90	Visual Language
10.	3.3	74	Visual Numeric
11.	4.5	77	Visual Numeric
12.	3.9	81	Visual Numeric
13.	3.4	79	Social Individual
14.	6.8	80	Visual Numeric
15.	5.8	82	Auditory Language
16.	6.2	90	Visual Language
17.	3.6	81	Visual Numeric
18.	3.3	76	Tactile Concrete
19.	3.9	84	Visual Numeric
20.	3.9	78	Social Individual
21.	8.3	89	Visual Numeric
22.	5.2	87	Visual Numeric
23.	5.9	78	Visual Language
24.	10.7	93	Visual Numeric
25.	6.0	83	Auditory Numeric
26.	5.2	88	Auditory Numeric
27.	4.8	83	Visual Numeric
28.	3.8	81	Written Express
29.	3.1	78	Visual Numeric
30.	4.2	86	Oral Expressive
31.	2.8	72	Visual Numeric
32.	5.5	81	Visual Numeric
33.	3.5	81	Written Express
34.	12.+	93	Written Express
35.	5.7	87	Oral Expressive
36.	5.3	78	Visual Numeric
37.	5.9	87	Auditory Numeric
38.	8.1	89	Written Express
39.	6.0	98	Auditory Numeric
40.	9.5	94	Auditory Numeric
41.	8.9	91	Visual Language
42.	12.+	94	Visual Language
43.	5.9	89	Auditory Language
44.	12.+	94	Oral Expressive
45.	9.3	86	Social Individual

Student Number	CAT Score	Academic Average	Learning Style
46.	9.9	96	Oral Expressive
47.	5.5	86	Visual Language
48.	4.4	79	Tactile Concrete
49.	6.0	85	Visual Numeric
50.	12.+	91	Visual Language
51.	9.9	83	Auditory Numeric
52.	4.0	88	Social Individual
53.	7.8	92	Written Express
54.	12.+	92	Visual Numeric
55.	6.5	87	Oral Expressive
56.	8.7	88	Auditory Numeric
57.	6.3	85	Auditory Numeric
58.	7.3	87	Visual Numeric

LEARNING STYLES INVENTORY

...ity Records, Inc.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES, INC.
FREEPORT, NY 11520

Name _____ Class _____

Instructions: Read the statement carefully and circle the number which best agrees with how you feel about the statement.

Sample: I would rather do work in the afternoon than in the morning. (4) (3) (2) (1)

A number "4" response means that you prefer to work in the afternoon. A response of "1" means that you very much prefer to work in the mornings. There is no right or wrong response, only the way you feel about the statement. You may have all the time you need so please respond to every statement. Now, if there are no other questions, go on with the survey.

	Most Like Me			Least Like Me
1. Making things for my studies helps me to remember what I have learned.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
2. I can write about most of the things I know better than I can tell about them.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
3. When I really want to understand what I have read, I read it softly to myself.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
4. I get more done when I work alone.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
5. I remember what I have read better than what I have heard.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
6. When I answer questions, I can say the answer better than I can write it.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
7. When I do math problems in my head, I say the numbers to myself.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
8. I enjoy joining in on class discussions.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
9. I understand a math problem that is written down better than one that I hear.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
10. I do better when I can write the answer instead of having to say it.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
11. I understand spoken directions better than written ones.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
12. I like to work by myself.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
13. I would rather read a story than listen to it read.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
14. I would rather show and explain how a thing works than write about how it works.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
15. If someone tells me three numbers to add, I can usually get the right answer without writing them down.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
16. I prefer to work with a group when there is work to be done.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
___ 17. A graph or chart of numbers is easier for me to understand than hearing the numbers said.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
18. Writing a spelling word several times helps me remember it better.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
19. I learn better if someone reads a book to me than if I read it silently to myself.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

LEARNING STYLES INVENTORY

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES, INC.
FREEPORT, NY 11520

1983 Activity Records Inc

Name _____ Class _____

	Most Like Me			Least Like Me
20. I learn best when I study alone.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
21. When I have a choice between reading and listening, I usually read.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
22. I would rather tell a story than write it.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
23. Saying the multiplication tables over and over helped me remember them better than writing them over and over.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
24. I do my best work in a group.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
25. I understand a math problem that is written down better than one I hear.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
26. In a group project, I would rather make a chart or poster than gather the information to put on it.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
27. Written assignments are easy for me to follow.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
28. I remember more of what I learn if I learn it alone.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
29. I do well in classes where most of the information has to be read.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
30. I would enjoy giving an oral report to the class.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
31. I learn math better from spoken explanations than written ones.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
32. If I have to decide something, I ask other people for their opinions.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
33. Written math problems are easier for me to do than oral ones.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
34. I like to make things with my hands.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
35. I don't mind doing written assignments.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
36. I remember things I hear better than things I read.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
37. I learn better by reading than by listening.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
38. It is easy for me to tell about the things that I know.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
39. It makes it easier when I say the numbers of a problem to myself as I work it out.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
40. If I understand a problem, I like to help someone else understand it too.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
41. Seeing a number makes more sense to me than hearing a number.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
42. I understand what I have learned better when I am involved in making something for the subject.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
43. The things I write on paper sound better than when I say them.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
44. I find it easier to remember what I have heard than what I have read.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
45. It is fun to learn with classmates, but it is hard to study with them.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)